97-84237-20

Pivány, Eugène

The case of Hungary in the light of statements...

Budapest

1919

97-84237-20
MASTER NEGATIVE #

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
PRESERVATION DIVISION

BIBLIOGRAPHIC MICROFORM TARGET

ORIGINAL MATERIAL AS FILMED - EXISTING BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD

943.9
Z
v.4

Pivány, Eugène.
The case of Hungary in the light of statements of British and American statesmen and authors. Budapest, Hungarian territorial integrity league, 1919.
34 p. 20 cm.

Vol. of pamphlets.

Only ed

RESTRICTIONS ON USE: *Reproductions may not be made without permission from Columbia University Libraries.*

TECHNICAL MICROFORM DATA

FILM SIZE: 35mm REDUCTION RATIO: 10:1 IMAGE PLACEMENT: IA (IIA) IB IIB

DATE FILMED: 11-7-97 INITIALS: PB

TRACKING # : 29313

FILMED BY PRESERVATION RESOURCES, BETHLEHEM, PA.

THE CASE OF HUNGARY

IN THE LIGHT OF STATEMENTS OF BRITISH AND AMERICAN STATESMEN AND AUTHORS.

BY

EUGENE PIVÁNY

AUTHOR OF „HUNGARIANS IN THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR", ETC.

HUNGARIAN TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY LEAGUE
BUDAPEST, 1919.

PRINTED BY JOSEPH KERTÉSZ
BUDAPEST, V., NÁDOR-U. 28.

Truth naked is stronger than falsehood in mail.
The wrong cannot prosper, the right cannot fail.

The Hungarian revolution of the 30th of October led to the realisation of the dream of centuries: the political independence of Hungary from Austria, which was soon to be followed by the establishment of a republican form of government. The new government, under the premiership of Count Michael Károlyi whose opposition to the war and the alliance with Germany had been well known, issued at once an order to the Hungarian soldiers at the front to stop the useless butchery, and undertook the necessary steps to conclude an armistice with the commander of the allied forces in the East, General Franchet d'Espérey.

However, the joy of having finished the war and put, after four hundred years of more or less open oppression, an end to the baneful rule of the House of Habsburg-Lorraine, was short-lived. The conditions of the armistice dictated by the French general were far more severe than the Hungarians — who had surrendered voluntarily without having been beaten in battle — were prepared to expect. The line of demarcation as fixed by the general laid open southern Hungary and Transylvania to occupation by the allied armies, but it was expressly stipulated that the civil administration of the occupied territories shall remain in the hands of the Hungarian Government. *Subsequent events seem to prove, however, that the armistice is binding only on Hungary which has to fulfill all obligations imposed on her, while the provisions supposed to secure her rights are violated at will by the occupying armies with the silent or open approval of the Allies.*

The line of demarcation as fixed by the armistice has not been respected. Hungarian officials who refused

to take the oath of allegiance to the Servian, Rumanian or Czech Government or to the respective National Councils, as the case may be, were removed by force, in some cases put in prison or compelled to flee. In this regard it was the Czechs who acted in the most arbitrary and brutal manner, making it a practice to carry away the prominent Hungarians of the towns occupied by their troops as hostages to Brünn or other places, exposing them there to the insults of the populace and treating them like common criminals.

Nothing could illustrate better who is the oppressor and who the oppressed than the attitude of the Hungarian Government on the one hand and of the Servian, Rumanian and Czech troops of occupation on the other hand toward the various national meetings recently held in Hungary.

Some Rumanians of Hungary gathered in a national assembly at Gyula-Fehérvár, or Alba Julia, then still in the hands of the Hungarian Government, where they claimed the „imperium" over not fewer than twenty-six Hungarian counties and declared their secession from Hungary. (It may be noted that the Rumanians make up only forty-three per cent of the population of the twenty-six counties and that the total number of counties of Hungary is sixty-three.)

Similarly, some Servians of the Hungarian territory occupied by the Servian Army met in what they called a national assembly in Zombor and passed a resolution declaring the occupied territory to be a Servian Voivodeship and part of the Yugoslav Empire. It never occurred to them that on the principle of national self-determination they had no right to pass such a resolution, since, apart from the fact that the Servians of the occupied territory are the descendants of refugees who had found an asylum from Turkish despotism on Hungarian soil, they are there also in a hopeless minority.

The Slovaks, not wishing to lag behind, held also a national meeting at Kassa, in which they declared themselves to be a nation free and independent from both Hungary and Bohemia, and proclaimed the independent Slovak Republic.

The Hungarian Government laid no obstacle whatever in the way of, and even facilitated, the free expression of the wishes of the non-Magyar races. In Great Britain and America it will hardly be thought credible, but it is a fact nevertheless, that the Hungarian Government went so far in its policy of *laisser faire* as to place special trains at the disposal of the Rumanian deputations which desired to attend the meeting at Gyula-Fehérvár. The Servian commanders, however, prevented the Rumanians of the territory occupied by the Servians by force from leaving for Gyula-Fehérvár and, by a liberal use of the birch, suppressed all political agitation (except such as favored the Yugoslav idea.) The Czechs are persecuting all Slovaks who attended the meeting at Kassa, and do everything in their power to win the unwilling Slovaks for the Czecho-Slovak state.

When, however, the Magyars, Germans and even some Rumanians, representing at least sixty percent of the population of the twenty six counties demanded by Rumania, held a meeting in Kolozsvár, the capital of Transylvania, to protest against the dismemberment of Hungary and the violation of the right of self-determination, several Rumanian commanders prohibited all railroad traveling in the direction of Kolozsvár and actually prevented large numbers of people from reaching that city.

In all territories occupied by the invading armies a rigid censorship of the press and the mail has been established, newspapers from Budapest and other still free parts of Hungary have been destroyed or mutilated, the right of meeting has been suppressed, and the transportation of coal, victuals and other articles into the unoccupied parts interdicted. As a consequence of the last named measure there is a most acute coal famine in Hungary (on account of the shortage in fuel only two of the Budapest hospitals are now heated), and by the time these lines appear in print, the gas works of Budapest will be shut down and the railroad service so reduced as to make the proper distribution of food impossible. In other words, the invading armies, with the apparent consent of the Allies, are driving the unfortunate country into anarchy.

The game is not being played in accordance with the rules of the Marquess of Queensberry. It is against the Anglo-Saxon character to strike a fallen foe, especially one who — like Hungary — had been forced into the fight against his will, and had fought gallantly and honorably. Although the fate of Hungary is to be decided by the Peace Conference, the Allies and the United States suffer that Hungary, which had been made defenceless by the armistice, shall be torn to pieces — in plain violation of the terms of that same armistice — by her greedy, revengeful and imperialistic neighbors.

What good reason can be advanced for the partition of a thousand year-old, geographically compact, highly civilised country among its inferior neighbors without the consent of the inhabitants of the regions to be detached, and for the creation of artificial nations, like the Czecho-Slovak and the Yugoslav?

Although so far no official statement on the subject has been forthcoming, it is understood that Hungary is to be dismembered on two counts: first, as a punishment for having been the ally of imperialistic Germany, second, on the principle of the right of self determination of all nations.

Now, as a matter of fact, it was the Allies (France, Great Britain and Russia) who — as will be seen directly — forced Hungary, much against her will, in the alliance with Germany. And as to the right of self-determination, it is just Hungary which has been the foremost champion of that right centuries, trying to escape from the dominion of the German House of Habsburg. Louis Kossuth's agitation in Great Britain, the United States and, later, in Italy was directed towards securing the assistance of those countries and of France, against Austria and Russia, should they try again to prevent Hungary from exercising her right of self-determination or, as Kossuth styled it, self-disposal.

It would be as crying an injustice to force a country first to take a certain attitude and then to punish it for having taken it, as to distort a noble principle against the historical champion of that very principle without even giving it a hearing before the tribunal which is to make a decision affecting its existence.

In the following lines I shall call as witnesses for Hungary some of the most prominent British and American statesmen and authors of the last and the present century.

*

The great upheaval of 1848, which swept nearly over the whole continent of Europe, was successful only in France. The liberals of the German and Italian countries, with the exception of Venice, soon had to drop their swords. Hungary alone kept up the struggle for a year

and a half, and was finally overcome only by the combined efforts of Austria and Russia, the two greatest military powers of the age. It was not merely the traditional military prowes and patriotic self-sacrifice of thhe Hungarians, admirable as they were, that made their magnificent struggle possible; in these qualities the other peoples may not have been much behind them. It was their inbred constitutional instinct; it was their possession of a constitution which, alone on the Continent, was not a single written instrument based on the experiences of others or the gift of a benevolent monarch, but was — like the English constitution — the natural growth of many centuries; it was their experience in self-government in the counties which — when the rest of Europe was groaning under the weight of feudalism — were semi-independent little republics; in short, it was their possession of free institutions and the memories of the blood and treasure spent by their fachees in obtaining and defending them that enabled the Hungarians to rally around their leader and keep the banner of liberty flying long after the others had failed.

There was widedspread sympathy and admiration for little Hungary battling gallantly against fearful odds both in Great Britain and in the United States. In a memorial addressed at that time to Lord John Russel and Lord Palmerston, said to have been written by *Lord Charles Fitzwilliam*, and signed by him and several other peers and members of Parliament, the following language was used, the object of the memorial being to ask the mediation of Great Britain in favor of Hungary:

„While so many of the nations of Europe have engaged in revolutionary movements and have embarked in schemes of doubtful policy and still more doubtful

success, it is gratifying to the undersigned to be able to assure your Lordships that the Hungarians demand nothing but the recognition of ancient rights and the stability and integrity of their ancient constitution. To your Lordships it cannot be unknown that that constitution bears a striking family resemblance to that of our own country."

Several public meetings were held in England and America with the same object. At one of these, held under the chairmanship of *Lord Dudley Stuart*, an address of sympathy with Kossuth and his army was voted, and promises were made of valuable aid. It is an odd coincidence that the name of the Englishman, who volunteered to deliver a copy of the address, to Louis Kossuth, was Roger Casement. It was this same man who, in September, 1849, carried a letter from Kossuth, then in exile at Widdin, to Lord Palmerston, in which Kossuth advised the latter of the Sultan's decision to surrender the refugees to Austria and Russia, unless they renounce Christianity and embrace Moslemism.[1] Palmerston's reply was that the Sultan should be supported by the entire British fleet, if necessary, in case he gave unconditional protection to Kosuth and his compatriots, a declaration which undoubtedly had great weight in inducing the Sultan to persist in his refusal to deliver up the fugitives.

During Hungary's desperate fight for national independence, however, the British Government did practically nothing to help her. It did not recognise the Hungarian Government, suffered Russia's intervention without a word of protest, and *abandoned Hungary to her fate.* (How different was the British Government's attitude toward the then non-existing government of the still non-existing Czecho-Slovak nation!)

The Government of the United States went further than any other government toward the recognition of inde-

pendent Hungary and giving her practical aid. *President Zachary Taylor*, seeing the general sympathy for the cause of Hungary, appointed, in June, 1849, *Ambrose Dudley Mann* a „special and confidential agent" to Hungary with instructions to report on the actual condition of affairs in that country and the advisability of the recognition of Hungary.

„My purpose — said President Taylor in his message sent on the subject to the Senate — as freely avowed in this correspondence, was to have acknowledged the independence of Hungary had she succeeded in establishing a government *de facto* on a basis sufficiently permanent in its character to have justified me in doing so, according to the usages and settled principles of this Government, and although she is now fallen, and many of her gallant patriots are in exile or in chains, I am free still to declare that had she been successful in the maintenance of such government as we could have recognised, *we should have been the first to welcome her into the family of nations.*"[2]

The American agent arrived in Vienna in August, 1849, a few days before the catastrophe of Világos. Being of a rather cauticus disposition, he never entered Hungary, but was satisfied with sending a number of higly interesting and sympathetic reports to Washington, which were published by the American Governement only in 1909.[3]

In Vienna he was surrounded by spies who managed to copy his letter of instructions, which — after an interval of a year — was made the subject of complaint by the Austrian Chargé d'affaires in Washington, Chevalier Hülsemann. In his complaint Chevalier Hülsemann said among other unwise things that „those who did not hesitate to assume the responsibility of sending Mr. Dudley Mann on such an errand, should, independent of considerations of propriety, have borne in mind that they were exposing their emissary to be treated as a spy".

The whole note was held in a tone of patronising and arrogant superiority, which gave *Daniel Webster* — who had become secretary of state for the second time just a few weeks before — a welcom opportunity to exercise his rare powers of dialectics and irony. His reply, known as *The Hülsemann Letter*, is unique in the history of diplomatic correspondence and will ever remain a classic of American political literature. Want of space prevents me from quoting from it extensively; I confine myself, therefore, to the following characteristic passage given in reply to the Chevalier's above cited remark:

„Had the Imperial Government of Austria subjected Mr. Mann to the treatment of a spy, it would have placed itself without the pale of civilised nations; and the cabinet of Vienna may be assured that, if it had carried, or attempted to carry, any such lawless purpose into effect in the case of an authorised agent of this Government, *the spirit of the people of this country would have demanded immediate hostilities to be waged by the utmost exertion of the power of the Republic, military and naval.*"

A few years later there was another encounter which coul'd easily have led to war between the United States and Austria on account of Hungary, had not Austria wisely chosen to withdraw with as much grace as was possible under the circumstances. The occasion was the celebrated case of *Martin Koszta*, a former officer of the Hungarian Honvéd Army, who had fled to the United States and there declared his intention of becoming an American citizen. In 1853. t. i. before he could acquire the full rights of American citizenship, he went on some temporary business to Smyrna, where he was attacked by a hired band of ruffians and thrown into the sea. There a boat of the Austrian brig-of-war *Hussar* lay in waiting for him and took him on board the *Hussar* where he was put in irons. The efforts of the American consul at Smyrna for his re-

lease were of no avail; the poor Hungarian was to be carried to Austria to be court-martialed for having been a „rebe".

Fortunately there appeared on the scene just in the nick of time, like the *Deus ex machina* of ancient times, the United States sloop-of-war *Saint Louis*, whose brave commander, *Captain Ingraham*, after consultation with the consul, ranged his sloop alongside of the imperial vessel and brought his guns to bear on her, demanding at the same time the release of Koszta within a specified time. The demand so forcibly expressed was complied with, and there followed only a lengthy diplomatic correspondence, in which Chevalier Hülsemann, the exponent of Austrian political principles, got again the worst of it.[4]

But to reurn to Louis Kossuth as the apostle of the right of self-determination. Having been freed from internment in Asiatic Turkey mainly through the efforts of the United States, he repaired in 1851 to Great Britain and the United States being welcomed in the latter country as the guest of the nation. It is not my intention to dwell at length on the enthusiastic reception, the honors showered upon him and the veritable Kossuth frenzy which took hold of the people of both countries; there is nothing to compare with it in the great war just finished. But I dare say that a perusal of Kossuth's British and American speeches will well repay the effort, for there is a great deal in them which may be applied to the present situation.

Kossuth struck the keynote of his mission in one of his first speeches on English soil, delivered at the banquet given in his honor by the *Corporation of Southampton*, when he said:

„And what is it which I request in the name of my poor country and in the interest of the oppressed

people of Europe, from the great, free and powerful English nation? Is it that England should take up arms for the restoration of Hungary? Oh no! All I request, and all I hope, is only that England should not abandon the weight which is due to her in Europe; that England should not grant a charter to the Tsar to dispose of the destinies of the world. Public opinion in England can establish it as a leading principle in acknowledging the fundamental right of every nation to dispose of itself and not to allow the Tsar to interfere with the domestic affairs of the nations of Europe. People of mighty Albion! this it is, and nothing more, which oppressed humanity expects, intreats and hopes for. As to the rest, leave it to the nations of Europe themselves."

The same thought recurred in Kossuth's reply to the address voted him by the *Corporation of London*, delivered at the *Guildhall* on October 30, 1851:

„When I declared — Let not your sympathy remain barren, help us to carry that noble cause to a happy issue; you have the power, so help, — when I spoke that, I intended not to ask England to take up arms for the restoration of Hungary to her independence and liberties. No, Gentlemen, that is the affair of Hungary herself; we will provide for our freedom. All I wish is that the public opinion of England may establish it to be a ruling principle of the politics of Europe to acknowledge the right of every nation to dispose of its own internal concerns and not to allow the interference of Russia in the domestic concerns of either Hungary, or of whatever other nation on the Continent, because the principles of freedom are in harmony, and I love, I am interested in the freedom of all other countries as well as of my own. These are the words which I again and again will repeat here in England and there in the United States."

In the United States he went even a step further. His efforts there were directed towards having the government declare the right of national self-determination to be a basic principle of the law of nations, the violation

of which the United States could not view with indifference, and to have it invite Great Britain to join the United States in that policy. What is this if not the germ of the *League to enforce Peace?*

There is also a third matter of world-wide importance, which Kossuth was the first to advocate in America. Having been told that his campaign might be wrecked on the almost superstitious respect with which the Americans of his time were wont to regard George Washington's warning to his countrymen to steer clear of „entangling alliances", he devoted all his dialectic powers and eloquence to a masterful refutation of the popular belief that Washington had bequeathed the idea of non-interference as a permanent principle of foreign policy.[8]

It remained for President Wilson, wielding that real power which the Hungarian exile had lacked, to carry into effect the three cardinal principles which, more than sixty years ago, Louis Kossuth had first advocated: *American intervention in European affairs, the right of self-determintion of all nations, and the Union of Nations for the protection of that right.* Is it to be the tragedy of Hungary that the very principles, for which Louis Kossuth had struggled in vain, shall be carried into effect now not for the establishment and maintenance of Hungary's independence, but apparently for the destruction of that independence after it had been finally achieved?

It has been proposed that the victorous Allies shall dismember Hungary now even as Francis Joseph, the tyrant, attempted to do in 1849. In this connection it will be worth our while to recall the words which Louis Kossuth uttered on the language question in New York.

„Let me ask you — he said — are you, the people of the United States, a nation or not? Have you a national government or not? You answer in the affirmative. Yet you, the people of the United States, are not all of one blood and speak not one language. Millions of you speak English, others French, others German, others Italian, Spanish or Danish, and even several Indian dialects — and yet you are a nation.

„*What makes a nation? Is it language only?* Then there is no great nation on earth, because there is no moderately large country in the world, whose population is counted by millions, where you would not find several languages spoken."

„No! It is not language only which makes a nation. Community of interests, community of history, community of rights and duties, but chiefly community of institutions of a population which, though perhaps different in tongue and belonging to different races, is bound together by its daily intercourse in its towns, the centres of its commerce and industry, by the very mountain ranges, by the system of rivers and streams, by the soil, the dust of which is mingled with the ashes of those ancestors who bled on the same field, for the same interests, — the common inheritance of glory and of woe, ties of common freedom or common oppression: all this enters into the definition of nation."

„That this is true, that this is instinctively felt by the common sense of the people, is nowhere better shown than in my native land at this very moment. Hungary was declared by Francis Joseph no more to exist as a nation, no more as a state. It was and is put under martial law; strangers rule, in a foreign tongue, where our fathers lived and our brothers bled. To be a Hungarian became almost a crime in our native land. Now, to justify before the world the extinction of Hungary, the partition of its territory, and again the centralisation of the dissected limbs into the common body of servitude, the treacherous dynasty was anxious to show that the Hungarians are in the minority in their own native land. They hoped that intimidation and terrorism would induce even the Hungarians — Magyars, as we are termed in our

own language — to abnegate their language and birth. They ordered a census of nationalities to be taken. They performed it with the iron rule of martial law; they employed terrorism in the highest degree, so much that thousands of women and men who professed to be Magyars, who preferred not to know any other language than the Magyar, notwithstanding all their protestations, were put down as Sclavs, Serbs, Germans or Wallachians, because their names had not quite an Hungarian sound.

„And still what was the issue of the malignant plot? Out of the twelve millions of inhabitants of Hungary proper the Magyars turned out to be more than eight millions; some two millions more than we know the case really is. The people intstinctively felt that the tyrant had the design to destroy, with the pretext of language, the very existence of the nation formed by the compound of all those ingredients which I have mentioned before, and with the common good sense which every nation possesses, met the tyrannic plot as if it answered: We want to be a nation, and if the tyrant takes language only for the mark of our nationality, then we are all Hungarians."

„But on the European Continent there unhappily grew up a school which bound the idea of natonality only to the idea of language, and joined political pretensions to it. There are some who advocate the theory that existing countries must cease and the territories of the world be anew divided by languages and nations, separated by tongues."

„You are aware that this idea, if it were not impracticable, would be but a curse to humanity, a deathblow to civilisation and progress, and throw back mankind by centuries. It would be an eternal source of strife and war, because there is a holy, almost religious tie by which man's heart is bound to his home, and no man ever would consent to abandon his native land only because his neighbors speak another language than he himself. The idea would be worse than the old migration of nations was — despotism would only rise out of the strife of mankind's fanaticism."

„And really it is very curious; nobody of the advocates of this mischievous theory is willing to yield to it himself, but desires that others should yield to it . . . *It is the new ambition of conquest, but an easy conquest; not by arms, but by language.*"

„So much I know, at least, that this absurd idea cannot, and will not, be advocated by any man here in the United States, which did not open its hospitable shores to humanity and greet the flocking millions of immigrants with the right of citizenship in order that the Union may be cut to pieces and even your single states divided into new framed, independent countries by and according to languages."

Of the many utterances of prominent Britons and Americans on Louis Kossuth's mission I shall quote only a few excerpts from the speech of *Daniel Webster* at the reception given to Kossuth in Washington, not because Webster was probably the most eloquent of his Anglo-Saxon contemporarires, but because he was — by his long political past — more entitled than any other British or American statesman occupying a responsible position to voice the thought and sentiment of the English speaking world.

„It is remarkable — he said — that, on the Western coast of Europe, political light exists. There is a sun in the political firmament, and that sun sheds his light, and everybody may rejoice. But in Eastern Europe, generally speaking, and on the confines between Eastern Europe and Asia, there is no political sun in the heavens. It is all an arctic zone of political life. The luminary that enlightens the world in general seldom rises there above the horizon. The light which they possess is at best crepuscular, a kind of twilight, and they are under the necessity of groping about to catch, as the may, any stray gleams of the light of day.

„Gentlemen, the country of which your guest tonight is a native is a remarkable exception to that rule, and in fact, to the nations that surround her. Hungary

is enlightened; she has shown through her whole history, for many hundreds of years, an attachment to the principles of civil liberty, and of law and of order, and obedience to the constitution which the will of the majority have established. That is a fact which ought to be known wherever the question of the practicability of Hungarian liberty and independence is discussed. *It ought to be known that Hungary stands out from and above her neighbors in all that respects free institutions, constitutional governement and hereditary love of liberty.*"

And again:

„The progress of things is no doubt onward. It is onward with respect to Hungary. It is onward everywhere. Public opinion, in my estimation at least, is making great progress; it will come more or less to animate all minds; and, in respect to that country, for which our sympathies to-night have been so strongly invoked. I cannot but say that I think the people of Hungary are an englightened, industrious, well-inclined community. And I wish only to add that I do not now enter into any discussion of the form of government which may be proper for Hungary. Of course, all of you, like myself, would be glad to see her, when she becomes independent, embrace that system of government, which is most acceptable to ourselves.

„*We shall rejoice to see our American model upon the lower Danube and on the mountains of Hungary.* But that is not the first step. It is not which will be our first prayer for Hungary. That first prayer shall be that Hungary may become independent of all foreign power, that her destinies may be entrusted to her own hands and to her own discretion . . . I limit, therefore, my aspirations for Hungary, for the peresent, to that single and simple point: Hungarian independence, Hungarian self-government, Hungarian control of Hungarian destinies!"

But in spite of all the enthusiasm, sympathy and fine words *Hungary was abandoned again to her fate*, and Kossuth returned to Europe, disappointed for the present, but not giving up hope for the resurrection of his country. The war of Sardinia and France against Austria for the unification of Italy, which was impending toward the end of the fifties of the last century, gave him an opportunity to place Hungary's cause again into the arena of European politics. He negotiated with Cavour and Napoléon, organised an Hungarian legion which fought for *Italia Unita*, and came to an understanding with the French Emperor that the latter will carry the war against Austria into Hungary, which will be the signal for a general uprising in that country. The changeable Napoléon, however, frightened by his own success, broke hir word to Kossuth, and concluded the premature peace of Villafranca *Hungary has been deserted for the third time within ten years.*

Two years later the United States were confronted with the problem, which is of great importance in judging the case of Hungary, whether the right of self-determination be applicable to nations only, or also to fractions of nations. The United States, under the wise leadership of Abraham Lincoln, decided the problem by declaring that those states which, pleading the right of self-determination, seceded from the Union, were rebels, and put the rebellion down in a long and sanguinary war. The case of Hungary *versus* certain of her nationalities, is very similar. And it should not be forgotten, either, that the Hungarian immigrants and refugees who had sought an asylum in America fought all on the side of the Union, and, although they were comparatively few in number, they fought so well that two of them became major-generals and five brigadier-generals, not to mention fifteen colonels and a number of lesser officers."

Seeing how Western Europe has repeatedly abandoned her, is it to be wondered at that Hungary finally con-

sented to the compromise of 1867, which restored, at least on paper, her constitution and acknowledged, at least in theory, her right to independence? The constant fear from the Russian colossus with its imperialistic designs made Hungary — which had no control of the foreign policy and the army of the country — yield to the desire to secure protection against Russian aggrandisement through an alliance with Germany, although there has ever been a strong antipathy against everything German in Hungary. As far as the masses of the Hungarian people are concerned, the great war was to them a war against Russian imperialism only. Their interests were nowhere in conflict with those of France and England; on the contrary, Hungary had been the only Anglophil country in Europe, as was plainly shown at the time of the Boer War. When, after the collapse of the Russian Empire, the war was still going on, they began slowly to realise that they were being bled for German interests, but by that time the military and economical organisation of the country was so completely in the power of Germany, that they could not separate themselves from Austria and Germany until finally, with a supreme effort, they cut the Gordian knot by the revolution of October 30th.

*

Although Hungary's past history and geographical compactness, pointing to the natural unity of the country, remained, of course, the same, there have been great changes of a political and economical kind in modernised Hungary since the compromise of 1867. It will be well, therefore, to consider the opinions of some English authors who had made a study of Hungarian conditions in comparatively recent times.

I refer first to *Mr. Archibald R. Colquhoun's* book,

The Whirlpool of Europe, published by Harpers in 1907, which treats of Austria-Hungary as a whole, and is by no means too friendly to Hungary. Under the caption *Slav and Magyar* Mr. Colquhoun wrote as follows:

„Although modified in appearance, in customs, and in character by the people they have assimilated, the Magyars have retained throughout all vicissitudes, an extraordinary homogeneity. Hungary has been a sovereign nation and a kingdom since 1000 A. D., and has never owned allegiance to any monarch who has not been affirmed and crowned by her Estates. Moreover, the Hungarian is the only complete nation under the Austrian crown. Even Bohemia, claiming similar historicrights, does not occupy the same position. Her people are not intact; Czechs are living under Prussian rule, and Czech territory has been reduced by the conquest of neighboring states. Moreover, there is within Bohemia a second nation, the Germans, with equal rights to the Czechs. Their position is therefore constitutionally different from that of Hungary as a free sovereign state and nation. The rest of the peoples under Austrian rule are detached fragments of nations, remnants of ancient states."

In the chapter entitled *Hungary and the Hungarians* we read the following:

„The Magyars, as said already, occupy a unique position in the Dual Monarchy, not only politically but racially, because they are an entire and homogeneous nation. The undeniable fact that they are by no means a pure race, but have assimilated other peoples, and have undergone physical and mental modifications as a consequence, does not detract from their position. *Like the United States (on a much larger scale) this little nation has been strong enough to stamp its individuality on alien peoples.*"

— — — — — — — — — — — — —

„Undoubtedly the present Magyar standard of comfort and decency is largely due to the high position always held by their women, and it is not too much to say that this fortunate circumstance has been largely instrumental in making the Magyars what they are and keeping up

their national patriotism. The women of all classes are, as a result, not only an important influence but worthy of the position they hold. The peasantry of both sexes are honest, self-respecting, sturdy, and industrious. Their manner is the reflex of their independence, mingled with natural courtesy. Everyone — peasant, overseer, shepherd, cowherd, or swineherd — kisses the hands of the ladies of their master's house, and there is no servility, only graceful courtesy, in the act."

— — — — — — — — — — — —

„It is better for a stranger to adress the middle and lower class people in French or Englich first, not with the expectation of being understood, but as a passport to favor, after which he may get the desired information in German. Although this is mainly the result of a policy of Magyarisation, there is an element at work in producing it which is more than mere State policy or compulsion. It is agreed by many foreigners living in Hungary that there is a contagion about the nationalist aspiration which is almost irresistible. In no country in the world are there to be seen so many divers races making one (despite local jealousies) in their support of Hungarian national tradition, and all are as vehement in their advocacy of Hungarian independence as the Magyars themselves. Jews and Germans swell with patriotic pride over their „ancient constitution", and more than one instance could be cited of Hungarian patriots (some well known as the exponents of the Magyars to Europe) who have not one drop of Magyar blood.

„The contagion, the attraction, are in the Magyar people themselves, and surely in this magic quality lies the secret of their success. *The magnetic force they exercise is doing work which mere coercing or manoeuvring could not accomplish.* Elements of weakness, of unevenness, and of danger there are, but the core of the matter, the character of the true Magyar, is not only sound, but is displaying that most valuable and intangible of qualities — the power of attraction and assimilation."

Mr. W. B. Forster Bovill, a student of politics, collected the results of his observations made during several

long stays in Hungary in a large volume under the title of *Hungary and the Hungarians*, published by Methuen & Co. in 1908. The following excerpts are taken from his concluding chapter.

„Undoubtedly the aspirations of the nation are towards full independence. To this to-day are several barriers. There is the barrier of Austria, with its superior position consequent largely upon the failure of the Hungarian revolution of 1848 and not the inherent genius of the House of Habsburg. To retain this superiority, which asserts itself in diplomacy and military affairs, Austria has always to fight, losing a little at every struggle. Austria fights to retain, Hungary to regain, hence the measure of fighting enthusiasm must rest with the Magyars. But this is not the greatest barrier to Hungarian complete independence. The great enemy Hungary has is herself. Let me repeat, Hungary is over political. An Hungarian engineer who had spent several years in America and Mexico was lamenting that fact me one day. Said he, „What is wanted is that all the Ministeriums should have at least fifty young Americans in them" „There is much in such a proposition. Genuine business capacity is scant indeed in Hungary."

— — — — — — — — — — — — —

„As a language, Hungarian is becoming more universal than ever it was before. There is also an increased commercial activity, a striving on the part of some to develop industry."

But the Enghlish *standard* work on Hungary, which no one who wants to examine the case of Hungary intelligently can afford not to know, is *The Political Evolution of the Hungarian Nation* by the *Hon. C. M. Knatchbull-Hugessen*, published in two volumes by the National Review Office in 1908.

German scholars are unsurpassed in the labor of collecting material, and not even the smallest and most insignificant data escape their careful and thorough research. But it takes an Englishman (or a Frenchman) to

sift the essential from the non-essential and, presenting the multifarious and often conflicting evidence in a manner which will not confuse the reader, to draw the logical conclusion. It is this rare gift of scholary presentation and sober judgment, which makes the work of the Hon. C. M. Knatchbull-Hugessen so valuable. I can quote here only a few passages from his opening and concluding chapters.

„The fact that a few thousand wanderers from Asia were able to preserve their individuality and institutions in the midst of an ocean of Slavs, Germans, and Turks, and obtained comparatively quickly a position of equality with members of the European family, argues the possession of exceptional military and political qualities, of exceptional cohesiveness, of a stoical capacity for endurance, and of a rooted confidence in themselves and in their future, which no vicissitudes of fortune have been able to destroy. The alien jargon first heard by European ears twelve hundred years ago has maintained its existence in spite of the competition of German and Slav dialects, of deliberate discouragement and temporary neglect, and has developed into a language which, for fulness and expressiveness, for the purposes of science as well as of poetry, is the equal if not the superior of the majority of European languages. Palacky, the great Czech historian, expressed the opinion that „the invasion and definitive establishment of the Magyars is one of the most important events in the world's history. Slavdom never received a more fatal blow during its existence of several thousand years. It extended in the ninth century from the borders of Holstein to the Peloponnesus... and the Magyar by driving a wedge into the heart of the state in process of formation destroyed it and therewith all the hopes of the Slavs." A people which has rendered such services to the cause of European equilibrium, which stood for centuries as the *antemurale clypeusque Christianitatis* between the Turk and the Western nations, and has shown such vitality and persistency in the past, is the chief defensive force to be reckoned with in the future should, as some

fear, a graver danger arise to the balance of power in Eastern Europe than was ever presented by the spectre of Panslavism."

— — — — — — — — — — — — —

„The army question constitutes a problem for the jurist as well as for the authority on military matters, and can no more be settled by the *obiter dicta* of foreign critics than the problem presented by the existence of fragmentary nationalities can be settled by the ill-considered intervention of foreign celebrities of the magnitude of Björnson and Tolstoi, whose *a priori* condemnation of British action in South Africa should make Englishmen hesitate to attach undue importance to his criticisms of an Anglophil nation. British public opinion has, apparently, arrived at the conclusion that the Magyars are consistently guilty of the employment of methods of barbarism in their treatment of subordinate races. Trial by newspapers, condemnation without investigation, are such labor-saving processes, that their employment is naturally popular, more especially when the means of forming a considered opinion are not easily accessible. The Magyars are themselves largely to blame for the fact that judgment has been allowed to be passed on them on the *ex parte* statements of self-interested agitators and of humanitarian philosophers, and that they are left to console themselves with the conviction that the abuse of which they are made the target is begotten of ignorance of actual facts, of past history, and of the vital considerations of national expediency. The problem presented by the persistence of minor nationalities is not confined to Hungary, but affects a large part of Europe, from Ireland to Bessarabia, and the measure of the abuse lavished by the spectator of the process of absorption, which is going on as slowly and as surely as in the past, is in inverse proportion to the magnitude of the absorbing nation. What Russia has done with impunity, would have evoked the thunders of Exeter Hall if perpetrated by a weaker country. Wreschen passes almost unperceived, while a petty Slovak village earns European notoriety through the disturbances resulting from the dismissal of a disorderly priest. The Irishman

INTENTIONAL SECOND EXPOSURE

sift the essential from the non-essential and, presenting the multifarious and often conflicting evidence in a manner which will not confuse the reader, to draw the logical conclusion. It is this rare gift of scholary presentation and sober judgment, which makes the work of the Hon. C. M. Knatchbull-Hugessen so valuable. I can quote here only a few passages from his opening and concluding chapters.

„The fact that a few thousand wanderers from Asia were able to preserve their individuality and institutions in the midst of an ocean of Slavs, Germans, and Turks, and obtained comparatively quickly a position of equality with members of the European family, argues the possession of exceptional military and political qualities, of exceptional cohesiveness, of a stoical capacity for endurance, and of a rooted confidence in themselves and in their future, which no vicissitudes of fortune have been able to destroy. The alien jargon first heard by European ears twelve hundred years ago has maintained its existence in spite of the competition of German and Slav dialects, of deliberate discouragement and temporary neglect, and has developed into a language which, for fulness and expressiveness, for the purposes of science as well as of poetry, is the equal if not the superior of the majority of European languages. Palacky, the great Czech historian, expressed the opinion that „the invasion and definitive establishment of the Magyars is one of the most important events in the world's history. Slavdom never received a more fatal blow during its existence of several thousand years. It extended in the ninth century from the borders of Holstein to the Peloponnesus... and the Magyar by driving a wedge into the heart of the state in process of formation destroyed it and therewith all the hopes of the Slavs." A people which has rendered such services to the cause of European equilibrium, which stood for centuries as the *antemurale clypeusque Christianitatis* between the Turk and the Western nations, and has shown such vitality and persistency in the past, is the chief defensive force to be reckoned with in the future should, as some

fear, a graver danger arise to the balance of power in Eastern Europe than was ever presented by the spectre of Panslavism."

— — — — — — — — — — — — —

„The army question constitutes a problem for the jurist as well as for the authority on military matters, and can no more be settled by the *obiter dicta* of foreign critics than the problem presented by the existence of fragmentary nationalities can be settled by the ill-considered intervention of foreign celebrities of the magni tude of Björnson and Tolstoi, whose *a priori* condemnation of British action in South Africa should make Englishmen hesitate to attach undue importance to his criticisms of an Anglophil nation. British public opinion has, apparently, arrived at the conclusion that the Magyars are consistently guilty of the employment of methods of barbarism in their treatment of subordinate races. Trial by newspapers, condemnation without investigation, are such labor-saving processes, that their employment is naturally popular, more especially when the means of forming a considered opinion are not easily accessible. The Magyars are themselves largely to blame for the fact that judgment has been allowed to be passed on them on the *ex parte* statements of self-interested agitators and of humanitarian philosophers, and that they are left to console themselves with the conviction that the abuse of which they are made the target is begotten of ignorance of actual facts, of past history, and of the vital considerations of national expediency. The problem presented by the persistence of minor nationalities is not confined to Hungary, but affects a large part of Europe, from Ireland to Bessarabia, and the measure of the abuse lavished by the spectator of the process of absorption, which is going on as slowly and as surely as in the past, is in inverse proportion to the magnitude of the absorbing nation. What Russia has done with impunity, would have evoked the thunders of Exeter Hall if perpetrated by a weaker country. Wreschen passes almost unperceived, while a petty Slovak village earns European notoriety through the disturbances resulting from the dismissal of a disorderly priest. The Irishman

and the Pole have a recent historical basis for their claims to independent existence, as well as the justification of antiquity, which is wanting in the case of the fragmentary nationalities of Hungary."

„The aboriginal population of what is now Hungary — scattered, incohesive tribes incapable of resisting Magyar arms, or, later, Magyar civilisation — died out or was absorbed by the superior race. The process of civilisation was purely Magyar. The development of governmental institutions proceeded along purely Magyar lines, and bore hardly a trace of either Slav, or, save for the fact that Latin was the literary medium, of Western influence. *As we have seen, the mass of the existing nationalities was imported, or filtered into, the country long after it had received a permanent Magyar stamp — desirable or undesirable aliens, who, in most cases, repaid the hospitality they received by lending themselves to the disruptive policy of the Habsburgs.* The disappearance or absorption of the aborigines was due not to violent compulsion fire or sword by but to the essential superiority of the Magyar nation, so convinced of that superiority that it never saw the necessity of Magyarising races which, in early days, having no conscious feeling of individuality, would have been as wax to receive the permanent impress of Magyar nationality. The gates were opened wide to European culture from the time of St. Stephen, whose maxim, *regnum unius linguae uniusque moris debile et imbecille,* shows his recognition of the fact that the only language and civilisation which had hitherto counted for anything in Hungary was the Magyar, as well as his appreciation of the benefits derivable from contact with the West... Civilisation, such as it was, was purely Magyar, and all governmental institutions were directly developed from the germ evolved by the Magyar national genius before the great migration westwards.

„The races imported into Hungary at a later date arrived too late to alter accomplished facts even if they had possessed a far higher degree of civilisation than any of them had in fact attained What they chiefly

cared for was freedom to exercise their various religions, and such freedom they received at the hands of Hungary, the land *par excellence* of religious tolerance. The better class aliens received the rights of nobility or became fused in the Magyar nation. The inferior elements remained apart, in a condition neither better nor worse than that of the great mass of Magyar peasants, and had little or no consciousness of distinctive nationality, or power to resist a deliberate policy of Magyarisation, had such a policy ever entered the heads of the predominant race, which, unfortunately, it never did. Unfortunately, for the reason that successive Habsburgs were enabled to utilise the forces of ignorance for the purposes of their traditional policy of *divide ut imperes* — of centralisation and absolutism. For the existence of hostility to the Magyar idea, tentative and embryionic before 1848, the Magyars have to thank in the first place their own consciousness of a superiority which made deliberate Magyarisation superfluous, and, in the second place, the Habsburg connexion..."

„*Nothing can be more misleading than the majority of the maps which purport to show the geographical distribution of the constituent races of Hungary.* The broad, uniform smudges of color which indicate that this part is Magyar, this Rumanian, this Servian, this Slovak, and so on, and serve as a text for the disquisitions of the prophets of federalism, obscure the fact that the various races are so intermingled in all parts of the country, and so interspersed with Magyars, that it is impossible to effect clear-cut geographical subdivisions for federalistic purposes such as are possible in Bohemia, where the country is peopled only by two races, the Germans and the Czechs, between whom the lines of demarcation are comparatively easily drawn. A glance at the map appended to the recent book of Mr. Ernest Baloghy *(A Magyar Kultura és a Nemzetiségek)* would do more to disperse erroneous notions as to racial distribution than many pages of statistics. Minute squares of color, showing the interpenetration of the nationalities, replace the familiar broad smudges, and the result bears as much resemblance to the ordinary ethnographic

map of Hungary as a pheasant's plumage does to the tricolor.

„The great central plain of the Danube and the Tisza is almost solidly Magyar, as is the Eastern part of Transylvania; elsewhere (except in Croatia) the patchwork diversity of color points an unmistakable moral — the impossibility of a territorial subdivision for purposes of local autonomy, which would not result in the subjection of Magyar and German intelligence to inferior types, whose sole claim to political differentiation lies in the fact that they speak a bastard variety of the languages of more important races. The Magyar element is wanting in not one of 413 electoral divisions; the German only in 37. Slovaks are absent from 211, Rumanians from 235, Croatians from 344, Servians from 351. Ruthenes are to be found in 57 divisions, and fragments of other races in not less than 360... Though the Magyars constitute no more than 54¼ per cent of the whole population of Hungary proper, they are more than three times as numerous as the numerically strongest nationality, whereas the German population of Austria forms no more than 38⅓ per cent of the inhabitants of the hereditary provinces. Between the subordinate races there is no cohesion or solidarity; the Magyar is the only binding element. Panslavism, Pangermanism, and Panrumanism, have alternated from time to time, and in every case the source of agitation was to be found outside the limits of Hungary. Rumanians and Slovaks have nothing in common. The Rumanian hates the Servian, and the Servian the Rumanian.

„The *German* settlements are too scattered for it to be possible to carve out a characteristically German territory not permeated with Magyar, or Slovak, or Rumanian elements, are too far removed from Germany to dream of union therewith, and too good Hungarians to wish such union were possible....."

„An inferior civilisation cannot swallow up a superior one. The *Slovaks* in the north-western part of Hungary are more compact than most of the nationalities, but they are on too low a plane to stand alone. In the north-east they are mixed up with Magyars and Germans

who would never submit to the domination of an inferior race which has never done anything for its adopted country or for itself . . . They had no conception of a separate national existence before 1848, when, as the author of the petition to Francis Joseph stated, they awoke from their sleep of nine hundred years' duration. Not until 1850 was there a Slovak grammar. In 1862 a society, the Matica Slovenska, was formed for the purpose of fostering the Slovak literature and promoting the use of the Slovak language — a task which was complicated by the fact that both literature and language had first to be invented . . . There are no scientific Slovak writings, and even the books in use in 326 shools in which the language of instruction is Slovak are Czech . . . *The very existence of a Slovak question, of a Slovak nationality, is a proof that the Magyars have not been guilty of undue interference with the natural development of subordinate races whose separatistic tendencies, devoid of historical justification, are the artificial producton of the traditional Habsburg policy, and of the times in which we live....*

„The *Serbs* of Hungary proper, less than half a million strong, are to be found in considerable numbers only in four counties. Elsewhere they are numerically unimportant, and provided that their ecclesiastical autonomy is respected, have no more wish for a separate political existence than they have for reunion with the inferior civilisation of their congeners in Servia, the limits of whose capacity for orderly self-government are sufficiently notorious. (The story of the member of the Skupstchina who asked, „Who is this Mr. Budget of whom they talk so much?" is presumably well known.) . . . .

„For centuries the *Rumanians* of Hungary had no notion that they could boast of a Roman origin. Not until they turned to Roman Catholicism did they conceive the idea that they were anything but what they are — Balkan Slavs whose remote ancestors were more or less Latinised by contact with the Roman colonial forces. It would indeed be remarkable if a Roman army of occupation had left no illegitimate mementoes of its stay in the country. But what percentage of Roman blood is likely to be traceable in its descendants after a nomad existence

INTENTIONAL SECOND EXPOSURE

map of Hungary as a pheasant's plumage does to the tricolor.

„The great central plain of the Danube and the Tisza is almost solidly Magyar, as is the Eastern part of Transylvania; elsewhere (except in Croatia) the patchwork diversity of color points an unmistakable moral — the impossibility of a territorial subdivision for purposes of local autonomy, which would not result in the subjection of Magyar and German intelligence to infer or types, whose sole claim to political differentiation lies in the fact that they speak a bastard variety of the languages of more important races. The Magyar element is wanting in not one of 413 electoral divisions; the German only in 37. Slovaks are absent from 211, Rumanians from 235, Croatians from 344, Servians from 351. Ruthenes are to be found in 57 divisions, and fragments of other races in not less than 360 ... Though the Magyars constitute no more than 54¼ per cent of the whole population of Hungary proper, they are more than three times as numerous as the numerically strongest nationality, whereas the German population of Austria forms no more than 38⅓ per cent of the inhabitants of the hereditary provinces. Between the subordinate races there is no cohesion or solidarity; the Magyar is the only binding element. Panslavism, Pangermanism, and Panrumanism, have alternated from time to time, and in every case the source of agitation was to be found outside the limits of Hungary. Rumanians and Slovaks have nothing in common. The Rumanian hates the Servian, and the Servian the Rumanian.

„The *German* settlements are too scattered for it to be possible to carve out a characteristically German territory not permeated with Magyar, or Slovak, or Rumanian elements, are too far removed from Germany to dream of union therewith, and too good Hungarians to wish such union were possible ....."

„An inferior civilisation cannot swallow up a superior one. The *Slovaks* in the north-western part of Hungary are more compact than most of the nationalities, but they are on too low a plane to stand alone. In the north-east they are mixed up with Magyars and Germans

who would never submit to the domination of an inferior race which has never done anything for it's adopted country or for itself ... They had no conception of a separate national existence before 1848, when, as the author of the petition to Francis Joseph stated, they awoke from their sleep of nine hundred years' duration. Not until 1850 was there a Slovak grammar. In 1862 a society, the Matica Slovenska, was formed for the purpose of fostering the Slovak literature and promoting the use of the Slovak language — a task which was complicated by the fact that both literature and language had first to be invented ... There are no scientific Slovak writings, and even the books in use in 326 shools in which the language of instruction is Slovak are Czech ... *The very existence of a Slovak question, of a Slovak nationality, is a proof that the Magyars have not been guilty of undue interference with the natural development of subordinate races whose separatistic tendencies, devoid of historical justification, are the artificial producton of the traditional Habsburg policy, and of the times in which we live.* ...

„The *Serbs* of Hungary proper, less than half a million strong, are to be found in considerable numbers only in four counties. Elsewhere they are numerically unimportant, and provided that their ecclesiastical autonomy is respected, have no more wish for a separate political existence than they have for reunion with the inferior civilisation of their congeners in Servia, the limits of whose capacity for orderly self-government are sufficiently notorious. (The story of the member of the Skupstchina who asked, „Who is this Mr. Budget of whom they talk so much?" is presumably well known.) ....

„For centuries the *Rumanians* of Hungary had no notion that they could boast of a Roman origin. Not until they turned to Roman Catholicism did they conceive the idea that they were anything but what they are — Balkan Slavs whose remote ancestors were more or less Latinised by contact with the Roman colonial forces. It would indeed be remarkable if a Roman army of occupation had left no illegitimate mementoes of its stay in the country. But what percentage of Roman blood is likely to be traceable in its descendants after a nomad existence

of over a thousand years in the Balkan Peninsula? *There is not a particle of evidence to show that the Rumanians were already domiciled in Transylvania when the Magyars arrived there.* As we have seen, the theory of a settled political existence in a permanently Romanised Dacia is a late invention of Sinkai and his followers. The idea of a uniform, united, Rumanian nation never occurred to anyone before 1848, and even after that date the ideas of Bishop Siaguna, the prophet of Rumanian union, went no further than a demand of local self-government and of ecclesiastical autonomy for the Rumanians of Transylvania. The notion of a greater Rumania was not yet conceived. . . . . By the peace of Paris, Russia's protectorate over Moldavia and Wallachia came to an end, and part of Bessarabia was incorporated in Moldavia. Later, the Rumanians were rewarded for their action in saving Russia from a fiasco at Plevna by the creation of a Rumanian Kingdom and by the loss of Bessarabia . . . . The Rumanians see a justification and an example (for a Greater Rumania) in Italy's struggle for union, oblivious of the fact that in that case the fight was for *re*-union, whereas there never was a Greater Rumania, united or disunited, that the scattered Rumanians never conceived the idea of a common origin till a few years ago, and that the country is yet to be discovered which can boast with certainty of being the cradle of the Moldavo-Wallachians or Transylvanian Vlachs . . . ."

„An Italian claim to Provence and a Russian claim to Brandenburg and Berlin on the ground that they were once occupied by Slavs would be no more absurd from the historical point of view (than the claims of the Rumanian agitators to the eastern half of Hungary.) As regards the demand for Rumanian control of Transylvania and of Hungary up to the Tisza, it is to be observed that the Rumanians are in an actual minority, forming about 40 per cent of the population; so whatever justification it may possess from other points of view, it has none from that of mere numbers . . . The towns are almost entirely Magyar, and when not Magyar are German, even in the parts to which Brote points as distinctively

Rumanian, wealth and civilisation are entirely non-Rumanian."

„But history, wealth, and education are of no importance in the eyes of separatistic agitators . . . According to a favorite lie intended for foreign consumption, Law XVIII of 1879, which made Magyar a compulsory *subject* of instruction, made it the compulsory *medium* of instruction in all schools, and the Rumanians were consequently deprived of the means of learning their own language. What are the facts? In 1881 there were 2781 elementary schools in wich Rumanian was the sole language of instruction, and only 322 in which both Rumanian and Magyar teaching was given. In 1892 the number of purely Rumanian schools had risen to 3289, and the Magyar-Rumanian to 364 — a 9 per cent increase in favor of the Rumanian language. The fact should be noted that, though the Rumanians of Hungary are on a lower educational level than any other nationality, there is one place where the darkness is still more intense than in Transylvania, namely, the Mecca of the irredentists, Rumania proper, where only 13 per cent of the population can read and write, and only 18 per cent of the children of the age of instruction go to school. The Magyars are to blame, not for robbing the nationalities of their language, but for not properly carrying out the law of 1879. So recently as 1897 of 3000 Rumanian teachers, more than 500 were ignorant of the language of the State; and to-day, for more than one quarter of the schools of Hungary, the Magyar is a non-existent idiom . . . .

„In 1894, out of one hundred million florins of direct taxation, Transylvania paid eight millions, and almost the whole of that sum was paid by the Magyar and German population. Budapest alone pays nearly as much in taxation as Transylvania, Croatia, and the Slovak districts put togethez. Under the circumstances, it would not be surprising if the tax-paying Magyar and German were favored in the matter of the Parliamentary franchise at the expense of the Rumanians, but such is not the case. No doubt, as in England, and still more so in Ireland, there are districts which are more fully represented than

their population entitles them to be, which would disappear from the list of constituencies if a new and reasonable scheme of redistribution were adopted; but on the whole, the Rumanians in Transylvania are over rather than under-represented, for the qualification is considerably lower there than in other parts of Hungary, so the Rumanians, who form the majority of the population, are actually favored at the expense of better educated races which have a far larger stake in the country . . ."

„What were the sins of which the Magyars were guilty toward the Rumanians which justified the actions of the latter in 1848? To have admitted them to a footing of religious equality, and to have put them on the same level as regards political rights and the right to own land as Magyars themselves. Before that date the Rumanian common people were no worse of than the majority of the dominant race which had no political rights and could not own real property. Unfit for freedom, it was not until they were free that they rose against their liberators . . ."

„Every nationality, said Deák, has the right to facilities for the education of its children in its own language — a right respect for which is carried to an absurd length in the Hungary of today, which spends 65 per cent of the sum annually spent on primary education on schools in which the language of instruction is not the language of the State . . ."

„It was a mistake to contribute to the survival of the bastard idioms of inferior races who may be capable to destroy a civilisation, but certainly have shown no ability to create one. Europe, or in any case England, has no use for a Hungary that is not Magyar. England's traditional policy favors the existence of a strong power in Eastern Europe, and Dako-Rumanism, and other separatistic fads, can only tend to threaten the existence or undermine the influence of that necessary power . . ."

„So far as Hungary, and the nationalities of Hungary are concerned, the best criticism of Springer's scheme (for the federalisation of Austria-Hungary) is to be found in his own words: „*Hungary is geographically the most concentraded of lands* — it is an ideal of concentration which will mock all attempts at political subdivision." „Every nationality which tries to carve out a separate national State for itself will immediately have all other seven nationalities against it." (Grundlagen und Entwickelungsziele der Österreichisch-Ungarischen Monarchie, p. 169.) . . ."

„(In the realm of the Habsburgs) the Magyars are almost alone in possessing something higher than a parish patriotism, and alone possess the constitutional, parliamentary instinct . . .It is, therefore, a matter of general interest that nothing should take place, which might tend to the weakening or dismemberment of Hungary. It seems that Palacky's much-quoted phrase requires re-editing. If there were no Hungary it would be necessary to invent one, were it possible to do so . . ."

„Hungary lies accross Germany's path, therefore the Magyars, the undermining of whose predominance is of essential importance to the Pan-Germans, are fit subjects for execration. That the Luegers and Schönerers, in fact, the Germans of Austria in general, make no concealment of their hatred, of the Magyars, is not surprising. Itt is partly the tribute paid by jealousy to superior political genius, partly the outcome of the fact that, as Tacitus says, *humane naturae proprium est odisse quos laeseris . . .*"

„There is a much-quoted saying to the effect that the Magyar is blind to everything that he does not wish to see." „Damn it, sir," said Nelson at Copenhagen, as he put his telescope to his sightless eye in order to be able to say that he had not seen the signal of recall." „a man has a right to be blind sometimes" and most of all when the future of his nation is at stake. Itt is also said that the hegemony of the Magyars is maintained, and can be maintained, only by artificial means. It is untrue. Beksics has justly remarked that the Magyars might well despair if national unity depended on grammatical uniformity. It is divergence of civilisation, not grammatical differences, which prevents the coalescence into a nation of heterogeneous elements. The history of centuries is the history of the abortive attempts to impress the Ger-

man stamp on Hungary, in which there has been, and is, only one absorbent civilisation — the Magyar."

*

The testimonies of prominent Britons and Americans presented above are entitled to special weight and consideration at the present moment, for not only were they given by unbiased and disinterested persons of superior intelligence, but they were also given at a time when the passions engendered by the world war had not dimmed the powers of perception and judgment of a considerable part of mankind.

During the four years, or more, that Hungary has been cut off from all communication with the Allies and the United States, her greedy and imperialistic neighbors have made the most unscrupulous use of their opportunities for misinformation and for promoting their own selfish designs at the expense of Hungary. The Hungarians are fully aware of this, and justly insist therefore that, in the spirit of President Wilson's enunciations, they, be given proper representation at the Peace Conference to refute the unjust charges and present their own case.

One thing is absolutely certain. A peace of violence and revenge instead of one of justice could not be of long duration and, particularly, the dismemberment of Hungary in violation of the dictates of history and of nature, would create a new *irredentism* of unprecedented intensity, and, thus, carry the germ of a new war in the East of Europe.

Budapest, December 31., 1918.

FOOTNOTES TO THE CASE OF HUNGARY.

1. *Kossuth in New England.* Boston, 1852. Pp. 20—22.
2. Senate Document No. 43, 31st Congress, 1st Session.
3. Senate Document No. 279, 61st Congress, 2d Session.
4. House of Representatives, Ex. Doc. No. 1, 33d Congress, 1st Session.
5. See particularly his speech at the municipal banquet of New York. *Report of the Special Committee on the Reception of Governor Louis Kossuth,* New York, 1852. Pp. 139—178.
6. For a list of Hungarian officers in the Union Army see the appendix in *Hungarians in the American Civil War* by the present author, Cleveland, 1913.
7. In 1917 the Rumanians of Hungary had
   5 seminaries,
   6 preparatory schools for teachers,
   4 gymnasia, or colleges,
   1 high school, or lower gymnasium,
   1 modern school, or Realschule,
   1 commercial high school,
   9 girls' high schools.
   1 manual training school, and

more than 3000 elementary schools, in which the language of instruction was Rumanian. They had also nearly 6000 churches with 4206 priests.

The Hungarian Government paid them the following state subsidies in 1917:

7,746.533 Crowns for their religious establishment,
7.767,765 Crowns for the maintenance of their schools.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE HUNGARIAN TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY LEAGUE:

The American Peace and Hungary, by Ct. Albert Apponyi.

A Plea in Support of Hungary's Territorial Integrity, by Consul-general E. Ludwigh.

The Case of Hungary in the light of statements of British and American statesmen and authors, by Eugen Pivány, authors of Hungarians in the American civil war, etc.

Hungary Before, During and After the World-War, by Julius Altenburger corresponding member of the Institute of Actuaries.

The Territorial Integrity of Hungary and The Peoples League, by Julius Wlassics.

La Vérité sur la Hongrie et sur la Politique Magyare, par M. Pröhle professeur a l'Université de Debrecen.

L'Integrité Territoriale de la Hongrie au point de vue du Chemin de Fer, par Cornel Tolnay, ancien secrétaire d'État et directeur général des Chemins de fer de L'état Hongrois.

Strassbourg—Metz, Pressbourg—Kassa, par Alexandre Pethő.

La Hongrie Avant, pendant et apres la Guerre Mondiale, par Jules Altenburger.

END OF
TITLE